



Fernando 11-18-8

AF
JPW

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Patent Application

Applicant(s): Fernando et al.
Case: 11-18-8
Serial No.: 09/788,582
Filing Date: February 16, 2001
Group: 2115
Examiner: Chun Cao

I hereby certify that this paper is being deposited on this date with the U.S. Postal Service as first class mail addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Signature Kevin M. Mason Date: January 19, 2006

Title: Method and Apparatus for Transferring Multi-Source/Multi-Sink Control Signals Using a Differential Signaling Technique

TRANSMITTAL OF REPLY BRIEF

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Submitted herewith are the following documents relating to the above-identified patent application:

(1) Reply Brief (original and 1 copy).

In the event of non-payment or improper payment of a required fee, the Commissioner is authorized to charge or to credit **Deposit Account No. 50-0762** as required to correct the error. A duplicate copy of this letter and Reply Brief are enclosed.

Respectfully,

Kevin M. Mason

Kevin M. Mason
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 36,597
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
1300 Post Road, Suite 205
Fairfield, CT 06824
(203) 255-6560

Date: January 19, 2006



Fernando 11-18-8

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

5 **Patent Application**

Applicant(s): Fernando et al.
Case: 11-18-8
Serial No.: 09/788,582
10 Filing Date: February 16, 2001
Group: 2115
Examiner: Chun Cao

I hereby certify that this paper is being deposited on this date with the U.S. Postal Service as first class mail addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Signature: *Vina Maurice* Date: January 19, 2006

Title: Method and Apparatus for Transferring Multi-Source/Multi-Sink Control
15 Signals Using a Differential Signaling Technique

REPLY BRIEF

20 Mail Stop Appeal Brief – Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

25 Sir:

Appellants hereby reply to the Examiner's Answer, mailed November 28,
30 2005 (referred to hereinafter as "the Examiner's Answer"), in an Appeal of the final rejection of claims 1-23 in the above-identified patent application.

REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in
35 Appellants' Appeal Brief.

RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

A statement identifying related appeals is contained in Appellants' Appeal
Brief.

STATUS OF CLAIMS

A statement identifying the status of the claims is contained in Appellants' Appeal Brief.

5

STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

A statement identifying the status of the amendments is contained in Appellants' Appeal Brief.

SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

10

A Summary of the Invention is contained in Appellants' Appeal Brief.

STATEMENT OF GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

A statement identifying the issues presented for review is contained in Appellants' Appeal Brief.

15

CLAIMS APPEALED

A copy of the appealed claims is contained in an Appendix of Appellants' Appeal Brief.

20

ARGUMENT

In the Response to Argument section of the Examiner's Answer, the Examiner asserts that the "STS represents the two signals:

1. There is a change of floppy drive status -- the STS is changing from high to low or low to high -- adjusting the voltage level from a previous time interval

25

2. There is no change in floppy drive status -- the STS is either stays high or low -- maintaining the voltage level from the previous time interval."

Appellants note that the states suggested by the Examiner were *not* disclosed or suggested by Tateishi. Tateishi only suggests utilizing a constant voltage level to indicate a particular state. While examples may exist in the prior art where, coincidentally, two states may be subsequently defined such that they are represented by a maintained voltage level and an adjusted voltage level, Appellants maintain that such

30

definitions (of states) are not taught by the prior art and were undiscovered prior to the present invention. The Examiner has not produced any prior art that teaches to indicate a first state by maintaining a voltage level, and to indicate a second state by adjusting a voltage level.


Thus, Tateisha does not disclose or suggest maintaining said voltage level of said control signal from the previous time interval to indicate a second signal state, as required by independent claim 1, does not disclose or suggest detecting a second signal state if said voltage level from the previous time interval is maintained, as required by independent claim 8, and does not disclose or suggest a memory element for maintaining a voltage level from a previous time interval; a comparison circuit for detecting a change in said voltage level from the previous time interval indicating an assertion of said control signal by another device; and an adjustment circuit for changing said voltage level from the previous time interval indicating an assertion of said control signal by another device, as require by independent claim 16.

Conclusion

The rejections of the cited claims under section 102 in view of Tateisha are therefore believed to be improper and should be withdrawn. The remaining rejected dependent claims are believed allowable for at least the reasons identified above with respect to the independent claims.

The attention of the Examiner and the Appeal Board to this matter is appreciated.

Respectfully,


Kevin M. Mason
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 36,597
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
1300 Post Road, Suite 205
Fairfield, CT 06824
(203) 255-6560

Date: January 19, 2006

EVIDENCE APPENDIX

There is no evidence submitted pursuant to § 1.130, 1.131, or 1.132 or entered by the Examiner and relied upon by appellant.

RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

There are no known decisions rendered by a court or the Board in any proceeding identified pursuant to paragraph (c)(1)(ii) of 37 CFR 41.37.